

CC Docket Nos 96-45, 98-171, 90-571, 92-237, 99-200, 95-116, 98-170 and NSD File No. L-00-72.

I am opposed to the proposed changes to the Universal Service Fund. I urge the FCC to carefully consider the impact of these changes on consumers before changing the current system. Charging \$1 or more per month regardless of how much or how little we use our phone is not fair. This will greatly increase the cost of phone service and it could impact the ability for myself and others to afford landline and/or wireless service.

I am opposed to the FCC proposal to charge \$1 flat fee instead of charging according to volume usage per customer. Here's why...

I grew up in Fairfax Virginia, moved to Kentucky where my family is from, then became a teacher. I have been a teacher in two Kentucky schools districts over the past 21 years. Recently, I have been teaching in McCreary County Kentucky for several years, which is in an extremely low socio-economic area. Eighty-eight percent (88%) of our total student enrollment qualifies for free/reduced school lunch programs. Our school district applies for USF discounts and is awarded discounts for several qualifying network services, which do not have a direct impact on student achievement.

First of all it is appalling that McCreary County families pay land-line USF charges considering the family median income of \$22,261 according to the 2000 U.S. Census Bureau. I am not in favor of a \$1 a month flat charge unless the benefits would directly impact student achievement through the use of technology.

I have a feeling the changes proposed are to allow other rich counties to qualify for services that have not been able to meet the 85%-90% free/reduced lunch status over the last 6 years. If this is the case, I am vehemently opposed to charging \$1 flat fee for USF instead of charging according to volume usage per customer.

Here is the real issue you should be concerned with. USF only allows for internal and external connections, and several other communication services that do not directly impact student access in schools. Many principals lack the training or interest to check email or utilize technology during teacher meetings. The fact that many do not expect technology to be used during instruction is outrageous. Sure, USF put phones in every classroom, now the teacher can talk to friends and relatives during instruction. Sure, it helps us with network service fees, but students are rarely allowed to use computers for instruction because there are not sufficient computers available or computer labs sit idle with screen savers running, or the classroom computers are not turned on during the day.

The USF was created to make phone service affordable in rural America and was updated to increase the availability of communication services to schools, libraries, rural health centers, educational institutions and low-income individuals in the United States. Now you want to change it and I do not think it is fair to charge everybody \$1 dollar per month regardless of how much or how little they use their wireless phone for interstate calls.

The proposed change is especially unfair for low-volume users that rely on wireless service for safety and security, and who make few, if any, long distance calls. A contribution system is fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory and should be left alone. Please do not penalize customers. Keep this fair. We don't have a blanket income tax on our annual salaries nor do we have the

same sales tax on a pack of gum and an automobile, so why should there be a "one size fits all" charge for wireless phones?